LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
MAY 22 1956
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
P25
.L287
v.1-5

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2024 with funding from
Princeton Theological Seminary Library

https://archive.org/details/vedicdeclensiono00albr_0

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
MAY 22 1956
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

LANGUAGE DISSERTATIONS

PUBLISHED BY THE

LINGUISTIC SOCIETY OF AMERICA

EDITED BY

GEORGE MELVILLE BOLLING
Ohio State University

AURELIO M. ESPINOSA
Stanford University

SAMUEL MOORE
University of Michigan

DANIEL B. SHUMWAY
University of Pennsylvania

NUMBER 1 DECEMBER, 1927

THE VEDIC DECLENSION OF THE TYPE *VṚKÍS*
A CONTRIBUTION TO THE STUDY OF THE FEMININE NOUN-DECLENSION IN INDO-EUROPEAN

BY

RUTH NORTON ALBRIGHT

JOHNS HOPKINS DISSERTATION

LINGUISTIC SOCIETY OF AMERICA
204 ST. MARK'S SQUARE, PHILADELPHIA

1927

THE VEDIC DECLENSION OF THE TYPE *VṚKÍS*
A CONTRIBUTION TO THE STUDY OF THE FEMININE NOUN-DECLENSION IN INDO-EUROPEAN

One of the most pervading of the feminine suffixes in the Indo-European languages is the *ī*-suffix, most clearly found in the Sanskrit *devī́* and the like, and represented in Greek by the nouns in *-ι/-ια* (originally *-ja*), in Latin by various types, among them stems in *-ī-c-*, and in Gothic by *-ī* and *-jōs*. There are faint traces of it in the other languages also, but it has a very weak foot-hold outside of Sanskrit, and, as in Greek and Gothic, has often given way to the more regular and more adaptable *jā*-stems. This is the case in Balto-Slavic and Celtic. In Slavic the remaining traces are as follows: a) nouns with the suffix *-ynjā*; b) a few in *-yja*, as well as a few masculines with the same suffix; c) present and perfect active participles, and comparatives, and the pronoun *si* [1]. Practically the same types exist in Lithuanian: a) the words *patì*, *martì*, *veszní*; b) present, future, and perfect active participles; c) the pronouns *jì*, *szì*, *kurì*; and d) feminine *u*-adjectives formed by cutting off the *u* and adding *ja* to the stem. The *ī* is often not Indo-European in character, but its prevalence shows that it has been generalized as a readily available feminine suffix. The Celtic parallels were first pointed out by Thurneysen [2] as that group of nouns which follow the *ĭ*-stems in the nominative singular and the *jā*-stems in the oblique cases as well as in the nominative-accusative dual [3]. As the Celtic treatment of final *is* and *ī* is the same, the nominative singular of an *ī*-stem would be indistinguishable in ending from that of an *ĭ*-stem.

The persistency and spread of the suffix have not, however, left the declension without a peculiar problem of its own; for in Vedic Sanskrit we find not one, but two, types of feminine derivative-nouns in *ī*, one clearly Indo-European in character, the *devī*-type, and the other,

1. For the Balto-Slavic types, see Leskien: *Die Declination im Slavisch-Lithauischen und Germanischen* (Leipzig, 1876) 8 f. and 11.

2. *KZ* 28. 145 ff.

3. For a full list of all Celtic words, but not in periods, see Stokes, *BB* 11. 80 ff.

the *vṛkís*-type, represented by some fifty-three nouns, following closely the nouns in radical *-ī*, a declensional type which is for the most part not to be found in the other languages. It is with this small group of Vedic nouns that this paper is concerned. It is an attempt to explain the source of their declension from a new angle.

It is by no means the first attempt; for the declension has been discussed by many scholars, who have treated it either as Indo-European or as a secondary product of Hindu speech. Before giving a brief history of the treatments of the declension in the past, however, I may best give the gist of the problem in hand. For this purpose I give the two declensions, *devī* [1] and *vṛkís*, in their Vedic forms, as the Classical form is of later development.

	devī-type	*vṛkís*-type
S.N.	*-ís*	*-ís*
A.	*-ím*	*-íam*
I.	*-yấ*	*-íā*
D.	*-yấi*	*-íe*
Ab.G.	*-yás*	*-ías*
L.	*-yám*	..... [2]
V.	*-i*	*-ī*
D.N.A.V.	*-í*	*-íā*
I.D.Ab.	*-íbhyām*	*-íbhyā̃m*
L.G.	*-yós*	*-íos*
P.N.A.V.	*-ís*	*-ías*
I.	*-íbhis*	*-íbhis*
D.Ab.	*-íbhyas*	*-íbhyas*
G. [3]	*-ínām* [3]	*-ínām*
L.	*-íṣu*	*-íṣu*

1. As the *devī*-nouns do not have the accent fixed on any one syllable, I have not accented *devī* in this study. In the paradigm, however, I call attention to the fact that *devī*-nouns, when oxytone, accent the endings when the stem-vowel becomes *y* before a vowel. A barytone noun, it will be remembered, maintains its accent on the original syllable throughout the declension. The *vṛkís*-nouns keep the accent on the stem-vowel even when it is written as a semi-vowel.

2. See below for the discussion of the locative singular of *vṛkís*-type.

3. Whitney quotes the accent of the genitive plural of *devī́* as *devínām*, as given here. The form itself does not appear in Rig or Atharva Veda. Lanman (*Noun-Inflection* 366) quotes *-ī́nā̃m*. Statistics show six forms for the first mode and eleven

Besides the difference in the endings, notably the nominative singular *-s*, there is a striking difference in the treatment of the accent, which remains fixed on the stem-vowel in the *vṛkis*-type, but shifts to the ending in the forms of *devī* in which *i* is written *y*. It is the presence of these two peculiarities that has troubled Indo-Europeanists in the past few generations. For there is in Greek also a feminine declension which has a nom. -ς and a fixed accent on the *ι*, the -ίς/-ίδος declension, and over the question of the mutual relationship of these two declensions much has been written. On the one hand the obscurity of the two declensions has provoked some scholars to identify them, while it has moved others to oppose this view without suggesting an origin for either, especially for the *vṛkis*-type.

Until 1879 the treatment of the Greek and Sanskrit representatives of the Indo-European *ī*-stems was confined to a comparison of the *devī*-nouns and the Greek nouns in -ια and-ιδ- with no discrimination, and the discussion concerned itself wholly with the origin of the -δ-. Bopp neglected the problem in his treatment of the Indo-European *ī*-stems in the *Vergleichende Grammatik* (II [1857] 247 ff.), simply assuming that the two classes in Greek were from the same Indo-European class. In 1858 Curtius (*Griechische Etymologie* II 207 ff.), explained the -δ- as a phonetic development from the *-ī*. Pott, however, refused to accept this ; he would acknowledge no source of Sanskrit *ī* save *yā* in his *Etymologische Forschungen auf dem Gebiete der indo-germanischen Sprachen* II 1. 888 f. (1861). A great many interesting observations and suggestions concerning the Sanskrit feminines in *-ī* and similar formations in the cognate languages were given by Benfey in 1861 in his quarterly *Orient und Occident* 1. 230-306, under the title *Einiges gegen die isolierenden Richtungen in der indogermanischen Sprachforschung*.

Pott failed to persuade Curtius, who reiterated his own theory in the fourth edition of his work in 1875 and expressed disappointment that Pott had been unable to see the value of so 'simple' an explanation. In 1878 Sievers in an excursus on Germanic nouns in Indo-European *ī*, in his article on the Germanic accent in Paul and Braune's *Beiträge* (5. 136-51), reviewed this declension in the other languages and arrived at the conclusion that only the nouns in -ια, or perhaps certain abstracts in -ιᾱ, were the Greek equivalents.

for the second (six stems). The *ā*- and *ū*-stems accent the genitive plural on the stem-vowel and the *ĭ*-stems on the final syllable. Perhaps the variation is due to the temporary influence of one or the other of these types.

A new note was struck by Mahlow in his treatise on *Die langen Vokale A E O*, in 1879. On pages 145 f. he made the first attempt to draw the *vṛkís*-nouns into the discussion by comparing them with the nouns in -ίς -ίδος, and the *devī*-nouns with the -ια-stems. Thenceforward the discussion proceeded from many angles involving assent and dissent. Danielsson, in the first of his *Grammatical Notes* [1], stated (p. 59) that the two declensions, *devī* and *vṛkís*, were doubtless originally identical, but that *proof* of such identity was clearly impossible. In spite of the comparison *vṛkís* : *ýlgr*, which has been sufficient proof to most scholars to establish the declension as Indo-European, he was willing to attempt an explanation of the Vedic *vṛkís*-type as an individual and secondary variation of the *devī*-type. His explanation was based on phonetic and accentual conditions, but did not convince those that followed. In fact Johannes Schmidt in his *Pluralbildungen der indogermanischen Neutra* (1889) and later from time to time in Kuhn's *Zeitschrift*, accepted Mahlow's theory and enlarged upon it.

An American scholar, Benjamin Ide Wheeler, next read a paper on 'Greek Nouns in -ίς/-ίδος' before the American Philological Association in July 1893. He discussed the declension from the Indo-European point of view (*PAPA* 24. li), and finding no etymological material that showed the δ in any other language, concluded that it was a Greek product. He then gave a tentative theory for the origin of the δ, which is beyond the scope of this paper to discuss. Finally Lommell in a Göttingen University dissertation in 1912, entitled *Studien über die idg. Femininbildung*, examined the word-lists of both declensions and from the obvious lack of unity of basis in the two types of derivation, both Sanskrit and Greek, concluded that they are not fundamentally the same [2].

No one has, however, made a constructive attempt to explain the origin of the declension in Sanskrit except Danielsson, who makes it dependent upon accent. Such a solution would obviously have to apply to all oxytone *devī*-nouns, which is clearly not the case. The present paper is an attempt to show that the *vṛkís*-declension is large-

1. *Om de indoeuropeiska femininstammarne på -ī*. Upsala, *Universitets Arsskrift*, 1881.

2. There are additional treatments by H. Moller, *PBB* 7. 545-6 (1880); Hirt, *IF* 31. 1-23 (1912). In his article on the Germanic accent, *KZ* 23 (1875), Verner called attention to the similarity *ýlgr* : *vṛkís* in accentuation. This was before Mahlow's treatise (1879), and I have failed to find any further comment by Verner after that had appeared. It may be noted that he does not discusse the *-s* > *-r*.

ly a secondary product of Vedic Sanskrit. There is in the Vedic dialect a demonstrable tendency toward mutual contamination of nouns in *ī* and those in *i*, and the *vṛkís*-forms in which we are particularly interested are in reality merely those usually found in compound root-nouns in *ī* (*su-dhīs*). From this stock of possible blend-forms I hold that *vṛkís*-forms were generally borrowed to suit the exigencies of meter. In all verse the tendency to draw upon rare or variant forms for the sake of the meter is common, so there is nothing abnormal in my suggestion that the so-called *vṛkís*-declension in the Veda arises from the metrical requirements of individual verses in which forms of this type appear. If we eliminate all cases where we may assume the operation of metrical necessity, the residue is too small to gather into a special declension, in view of the situation in Indo-European.

The following table does not include all the differences between the two declensions, but only those that are of real metrical importance[1]:

	devī-type	*vṛkís*-type
S.A.	*-īm*	*-íam*
D.N.A.V.	*-ī*	*-íā*
P.N.A.V.	*-īs*	*-ías*

The remaining plural case-forms are identical save for the possibility of accentual variation in the genitive; the instrumental-dative-ablative dual is also identical. Hence these do not come into consideration and may be called indeterminate cases. Of the above forms there are of the *vṛkís*-declension 19 acc. sg.; 11 nom.-acc. dual; 44 nom.-acc. pl.; the indeterminate forms number 36. The total number of generally accepted *vṛkís*-forms is 170. Of this total, one noun, *nadí*, appears 55 times as *vṛkís*-type; it also appears 3 times as *devī*-type.

There are some 53 *vṛkís*-nouns, divided into three classes by Professor Lanman (*Noun-Inflection* 368): '(a) 22 having masculine barytones (mostly in *-a*), all but 5 feminine animate beings; (b) 12 denot-

1. It must be emphasized again that I do not consider metrical convenience as the ultimate explanation of the origin of the *vṛkís*-forms. The latter originated in the operation of paradigmatic contamination, but their convenience for metrical use led to their admission into the Veda in such numbers that they almost attained the dignity of a separate declension in the Rig Veda. As a good illustration of the influence of contamination in *i*-stems where there is no metrical requirement, I may cite the word *oni*, which has an accusative singular *onim* (*gati*), but a genitive dual *onios* (*vṛkís*).

ing feminine animate beings, but not corresponding to barytone masculines [1]; and (c) 19 showing no shift of accent and not designating animate beings [2]. There are thirteen masculine words that follow this declension, and some of these will be treated in passing.

I base my study and judgment of each particular case on the following simple criteria which involve the common meters of the Vedic hymns, *anuṣṭubh*, *triṣṭubh*, and *jagatī* verses. In the *anuṣṭubh* the only strict requirement of the verse is the number of syllables—eight; the cadence is generally iambic, but the final syllable may be long or short. If therefore there is a dissyllabic ending in the case of the *vṛkis*-declension and a monosyllabic ending in the case of the *devī*-declension (cf. A.P. *-ías* : *-īs*), the word may be attracted to the former declension if the extra syllable is needed by the syllabic count of the verse. This might also be the case in any part of the verse, including the cadence, since the length of the final syllable is optional. In the case of *triṣṭubh* or *jagatī* verse, however, the question is more difficult since the difference in these two meters consists exactly in the difference in the cadence, *triṣṭubh*, _⏑_⏑ ; *jagatī* _⏑_⏑⏑, while each requires seven syllables before the cadence, with minor caesura after the fourth or fifth. Syllabic count therefore enters in merely in the case of these seven (indifferent) syllables which precede the cadence. The cadence itself may come into consideration, however, under one condition, for it is possible that a word appearing as the final of a cadence of a hymn that is otherwise consistently *jagatī* might be attracted to the *vṛkis*-form in order that the general flow of the hymn remain unbroken by a single *triṣṭubh* verse. Further points that may come up will be discussed with the individual verses.

We may now turn to the consideration of the forms as they appear and the particular occurrences where metrical convenience may be proposed as a solution of the problem. Under each case-form I divide the material as follows : a) words appearing only in that case; b) words appearing in other case forms than that under consideration.

1. This statement may lead to confusion. What is really the case is that of the 12, 8 have oxytone masculines, 3 have no masculines, and one word, *starís*, though prevailingly feminine (8 out of 9 occurrences, all of which are nom. sing.), has one masculine form in the nominative singular, *starís*, 8. 51. 7.

2. Again misleading. The question of masculine form and 'shift of accent' is beside the point, since all these are names of inanimate objects, and have only 'grammatical' gender.

Where no comment is made the word illustrates my theory. Where a corresponding masculine form exists, it is given in parenthesis.

I. Accusative Singular : *devīm* : *vṛkíam.*

a) Words appearing in this case only.

prapharvī́ —

anyā́m icha prapharvyàm 10.85.22.

vibālī́ —

utá síndhum vibālyàm 4.30.12.

sūrmī́ —

sūrmyàṁ suṣirā́m iva 8.58.12.

siṅhī́ : (*siṅhá*) —

siṅhyàṁ cit pétvenā jaghāna 7.18.17.

viśvarūpī́ : (*viśvárūpa*) —

viśvarūpyàṁ triṣú yójaneṣu 1.164.9.

This word shows the shift of accent from its masculine which is barytone, and this is its only occurrence. There is, however, a feminine form *viśvárūpā* which appears five times and has the accent of the masculine. It appears in the accusative singular twice :

yé dhenúṁ viśvajúvaṁ viśvárūpām 4.33.8.
bṛ́haspátir viśvárūpām upājata 1.161.6.

These two forms together with the others in *-ā*, show that the regular feminine is in *-ā*. The position of the accent would also point to the same conclusion. It will be observed, however, that the form *viśvárūpām* would be incompatible with the meter in the single occurrence of *viśvarūpyàm*. Hence the change in declension. For the accompanying change in accent, see below.

ambī́ —

véti stótava ambyàm 8.61.5.

This word also exhibits two declensions, as the nominative plural is from the *ī*-stem :

ambáyo yanty ádhvabhiḥ 1.23.16.

That the change is probably from the *-ī* to the *vṛkís*-type is shown by the fact that while the form *ambyàs* would have done service in the second pāda the form *ambīm* is impossible in the first.

atharvī́ : (*átharvan*) [1] —

yā́bhir viṣpálām dhanasā́m atharvyàm 1.112.10.

1. Pischel (*Ved. Stud.* 1.172) disagrees with Roth, Ludwig, and Grassmann, and

This is one of the few examples of a word that is attracted to the *vṛkīs*-form by the power of the uniform rhythm of the hymn, of which the first 23 verses, out of a total of 25, are *jagatī*. For the change of accent, see below. Another word of this type is *aṣṭakarṇī*, given below.

b) Words having other case forms also :

arāyī : (*árāya*) [1] —

arāyyàṁ brahmaṇas pāte 10.155.2.

This is the only occurrence that goes directly against the theory. The word must be read in three syllables and should therefore have the *devī*-form *drāyīm*. It is perhaps a late form as it appears Atharvanic, and so would be apt to share the confusion of the two declensions, which are not kept apart in the later Vedas and tend to assume the classical form. For the change of accent, see below.

naptī : (*náptar*) —

śáśad váhnir duhitúr naptyàṁ gāt 3.31.1.

vṛkī : (*vṛ́ka*) [2] —

yāváyā vṛkyàṁ vṛ́kam 10.127.6.

vṛkī and *naptī* are of interest because they belong to the small number of nouns found also in the cognate languages. Cf. Old Norse *ylgr* and Latin *neptis*.

gāurī (*gāurá*) —

yáthā ha tyád vasavo gāuryàṁ cit 4.12.6 = 10.126.8.

This word is one of the few which exhibit the locative singular, which will be treated below.

yamī : (*yamá*) —

yamásya mā yamyàṁ kā́ma ā́gan 10.10.7.

starī : (*starī́*) —

jásuraye staryàṁ pipyathur gā́m 1.116.22.

ádhenuṁ dasrā staryàṁ viṣakṭā́m 1.117.20.

In these two occurrences the *y* is resolved according to rule, but in the following this may not be done according to Lanman, who is, however,

interprets the word *Viśpalā* as '*eine Stute*', hence *atharvī* as 'fiery', disregarding all connection with *átharvan*. I am not entirely convinced, in view of the derivative *v* in each word.

1. So Lanman, *Noun-Inflection* ; but *KZ* 32. 299 from *arí-*, as *agnāyi-* from *agní-*.

2. The accent on the reduced vowel tempts one to believe that it is the masculine in which the change of accent has arisen. This is not the only case in which such change occurs, however. Cf. Collitz, *Das schwache Prāt.* (*Hesperia* 1.182-3).

working from a preconceived theory of the origin of the form *chakty* (*Noun-Inflection* 380). Edgerton suggests the resolving of the *y* in *staryam* and the retaining of the *y* in *chakty* :

staryàṁ cic chakty aśvinā śácībhiḥ 7.68.8.

nadí —

te anyámanyāṁ nadyàṁ sanişṇata 1.131.5.

nadí is the only *vṛkís*-noun that appears ten or more times in the Rig Veda, and it appears fifty-five times, or about one third of all the occurrences of the *vṛkís*-declension. Of these forms, twenty-nine are genitive or locative plural, in other words, indeterminate forms, and of the remaining forms all are in positions involving possible metrical convenience, except for two genitives singular. The word has a *devī*-form in one of these occurrences besides two other forms that are best read as *devī*-forms. The above is the only accusative singular.

To illustrate my attitude I may add a few remarks here. Let us suppose for the time being that instead of the fifty-five occurrences in the Rig Veda the noun had the single form *nadyàm*. In that case the believer in the Indo-European origin of the declension would have to reconstruct the nominative singular as *nadís*. What then of the Atharvan form *nadí*, occurring twice, and *nadím*, once ? It is true that the *ī*-declensions are in a state of flux in the Atharvan ; but the forms in *-ís* and *-yàm* occur and might be expected to show some trace in this word which appears in the plural as well as in these two singular forms. My point is merely this : in a complicated and also small declension which shows many peculiarities in words already showing many forms, we can scarcely draw any conclusions from a given form as to the form to be expected in another case. This will become more evident as I show again and again single *vṛkís*-forms where the remaining declension is from an entirely different stem (cf. *viśvarūpí*, above).

nándi —

tríṛ nándyàṁ vahataṁ aśvinā yuvám 1.34.4.

Here the minor caesura follows the word and the dissyllabic ending is necessary to supply the four syllables before it.

To summarize : 16 nouns appear in the Accusative singular : of these 6 appear in no other case-form, and of these 6, 2 are in reality by-forms where the original declension would yield forms incompatible with the meter. The form *arāyyàm* may be explained as an irregularity due to the lateness of the hymn.

II. Nominative-Accusative Dual : *devī* : *vṛkíā*.

a) Words appearing in these cases only :

sakthí : (*sákthi* ?) —

antarā́ sakthyà kápṛt 10.86.16,17.

Quite obviously the shorter *devī*-form would be incompatible here. The question of the shift of accent is interesting also. Lanman assumes the noun from which the feminine is derived as *sákthi*, neuter; there is also, however, the stem *sakthán*, with identical meaning and gender, but with the accent on the final syllable. Each of these words appears only once in the Rig Veda. The Atharvan form is *sakthyā̀u*.

b) Words appearing in other cases also :

naptī́ : (*náptar*) —

mākī́ ráṇasya naptyā̀ 8.2.42.

sr̥ṇī́ —

sr̥ṇyèva jarbhárī turphárītū 10.106.6.

This word also presents the problem of two declensions. *sr̥ṇī́* : *sr̥ṇī́*. The former appears only once, in the genitive singular, the latter twice, once in the above form and again in the genitive singular. The Atharva Veda has also the form *sr̥ṇyàs* [1], 3. 17. 2. The pāda is really a repetition of RV 10. 101. 3, with a change of the final verb and cadence. The *devī*-form would be possible in the pāda cited above, but the *vr̥kī́s*-form prevents the hiatus and may have been used for that reason.

yamī́ : (*yamá*) —

ihéha jāte yamyā̀ sábandhū 5.47.5.
ví yó mamé yamyā̀ samyatī́ mádaḥ 9.68.2.

There is also a nominative dual from an *ā*-stem, *yamé* :

yamé iva yátamāne yád āitam 10.13.2

This would have been a possible solution for *sr̥ṇī iva* and we should have had three stems for the three occurrences.

cakrī́ : (*cakra* ?) —

ví vartete áhanī cakríyeva 1.185.1.
vartáyata tā́puṣā cakríyābhi tám 2.34.9.
prá cakríyeva ródasī marúdbhyaḥ 5.30.8.
yó ákṣeṇeva cakríyā śácībhiḥ 10.89.4.

Grassmann considered these as instrumental singulars, but Lanman lists them as dual forms. In his translation Grassmann himself treats the last two as such. Because the *ī* of the *devī*-dual is *pragr̥hya*, only the last of these

1. The accent in Whitney's *Index* is incorrect.

forms is required by the meter to be a *vṛkís*-form, but again we have the possibility of a hiatus-filler. It is also possible that this word was felt to be a root-noun from the reduplicated stem *cakr-*, since the treatment of the stem-final is that of the radical nouns, cf. *dhiyá*, etc. See also *yayí*, below.

nadí —

vā́tevājuryā́ nadyèva rītíḥ 2.39.5.
antár nadí te patáyanty ukṣáṇaḥ 1.135.9.

Here we have one form from each declensional type. I suggest that these two show the different treatment of the ending before *i* and before any other sound.

kṣoṇí —

sáṁ kṣoṇí śám u sū́ryam 7.7.22.Val.4.10.
kṣoṇí śíśuṁ ná mātárā 8.88.6.

This is one of the words which is judged *vṛkīs*-type on the strength of one form, in spite of eleven *devī*-forms and one *gati*-form. In my opinion, the two forms here are *devī*-type because there is nothing to change them. The word will be discussed further below.

gāurí : (*gāurá*) —

sómo gāurí ádhi śritáḥ 9.12.3.

This is considered a dual form by Grassmann, but Lanman considers it locative singular, *devī*-type. Schmidt, *Pluralbildung* 55, note, considers it *vṛkís*-locative. See below for discussion.

Summarizing again : We have 7 *vṛkís*-nouns appearing in nominative and accusative dual ; of these, 11 occurrences are the *vṛkis*-type, and 4, from 2 nouns, are *devī*-type. The *devī*-type is the only form of *kṣoṇí* and one of the two of *nadí*. In post-Rig-Vedic texts the *vṛkís*-nouns appear in *-íāu*.

III. Nominative Plural : *devīs* : *vṛkías*.

a) Words appearing in this case only :

mayūrí : (*mayū́ra*) —

tríḥ saptá mayūryàḥ 1.191.14.

The *vṛkís*-form provides the proper cadence for a poor verse.

vakṣí —

súsaṁśitā vakṣyò vakṣaṇeṣṭā́ḥ 5.19.5.

b) Words appearing in other cases also :

enī́ : (*éta*) —

ví yád vártanta enyàḥ 5.53.7.
ā́ yát pátanty enyàḥ 8.58.10.

The masculine of this word is *éta*, and so we have here the shift of accent. This is not the whole matter, however, for besides these two occurrences the feminine of *éta* appears eight times in the Rig Veda, with the stem *énī* (type *devī*). The three occurrences of the latter stem in the nominative plural I give to illustrate what seems to me to be the basis for choice.

ékaṁ yád udnā́ ná pṛṇánty énīḥ 5.85.6.
āmā́daḥ kṣviṅkās tám adantv énīḥ 10.87.7.
yásya dhárman svàr énīḥ 10.20.2.

In these pādas the same line of reasoning might be followed as I have given above for *atharvī*, that the continued flow of the meter of the entire hymn attracted the first two forms to the *devī*-type, and that the syllabic count created the necessity for the last. The fact that the word in its *devī*-type shares the accent of the masculine *éta* would have to be explained on this hypothesis, however, as well as the fact that the nominative is always non-sigmatic, and that the forms *énīm* and *énī* (dual) appear twice and once respectively. Hence it is best to conclude that the forms *enyàs* and not *énīs* are due to metrical necessity. It is certainly striking that the shift of accent accompanies the sole occurrence of a *vṛ́kīs*-form in this word. A few words like this with the two declensions show more clearly the tendency of metrical necessity than a number of words having only the *vṛ́kīs*-declension.

kalyāṇī́ : (*kalyā́ṇa*) —

kalyāṇyàḥ smáyamānāso agníṁ 4.58.8.

The minor caesura follows the word in question, which furnishes the requisite number of syllables.

rathī́ : (*rátha* ?) —

tvád vāvakre ráthyò ná dhénāḥ 7.21.3.

This word is exceedingly difficult to analyse as it has a masculine of exactly the same form and accent. Grassmann notes four forms as feminine, but Lanman, *Noun-Inflection* 373, reduces the number to two. The gender of the word is apparently determined by that of the word to which it is compared, as both the occurrences are in comparisons. Hence the above and the following are feminine :

gíro devi rathī́r iva 5.16.17.

But more important in the discussion of this word is the claim of a shift of accent from the neuter *rátha*. The word can in no way be a feminine derivative from *rátha*, but is rather the word *rathī́s*, masculine, considered

only momentarily, if at all, as feminine, for the sake of the comparison. This masculine also shares the so-called shift of accent, which can therefore hardly be due to the feminine gender.

aruṇí : (*aruṇá*) —

íṣaṁ váram aruṇyò varanta	1.140.13.
tắ añjáyo 'ruṇáyo ná sasruḥ	10.95.6.

These two pādas show the two ways of filling ont the syllabic count of a form in the case under discussion. The feminine form is very interesting in that it occurs in three declensions, *vṛkís-*, *devī-*, and *gati-*, not to mention the stem *aruṇā-* in 5. 63. 6 [1]. The accusative plural is consistently *devī*-form, see below. For a similar treatment of the nominative plural as in *aruṇáyas*, see under *ambí*.

gāurí : (*gāurá*) —

mádhvaḥ pibanti gāuryàḥ	1.84.10.

starí —

ắpaś cit pipyu staryò ná gávaḥ	7.23.4.

yayí : (*yayí*) —

síndhavo ná yayíyo bhrắjadṛṣṭayaḥ	10.78.7.

The masculine is used in the accusative singular once. For the treatment of the stem-final as *-iy-*, compare *cakrí* above.

nadí —

mádhvarṇaso nadyàś cátasraḥ	1.62.6.
asyá śrávo nadyàḥ saptá bibhrati	1.102.2.
ná mā garan nadyò mātṛtamāḥ	1.158.5.
véṣantīr ūrdhvắ nadyò na ắguḥ	1.181.6.
samānám ūrvắṁ nadyàḥ pṛṇanti	2.35.3.
íṣaṁ jaritré nadyò ná pīpeḥ	4.16.21.
vṛṣṇaḥ pátnīr nadyò vibhavataṣṭắḥ	5.42.12.
dhánvarṇaso nadyàḥ khắdoarṇāḥ	5.45.2.
sudītáyo nadyàs trắmane bhuvan	5.46.6.
cáranti yán nadyàs tasthúr ápaḥ	5.47.5.
ná párvatā ná nadyò varanta vaḥ	5.55.7.
mṛjánti tvā nadyàḥ saptá yahvíḥ	9.92.4.
pratīpáṁ śắpaṁ nadyò vahanti	10.28.4.
utém avardha nnadyàḥ svágūrtāḥ	10.95.7.

1. I quote Lanman 372, '...with some hesitation, I have referred *aruṇí* to C on account of the forms *aruṇís* N.s., 2 : *-ías*, text *-ís*, G.s. ; *-ías*, N.p. ; *ínām* not *-ínắm* ; *íshu* indifferent. But we have A.p. *-ís* (B) twice'.

**

We may note that in all these cases except perhaps the eleventh the word forms the anapaest which is properly found after the minor caesura. These occurrences are all regular *vṛkís*-forms, but the following is correct in accentuation and spelling, but cannot be read metrically as the form demands :

sárvā nadyò aśimidā́ bhavantu 7.50.4.

Grassmann suggests *nadís* (proper *devī*-form), but Lanman reads with the stem-final consonantized as though written *nadyás*. In my estimation one of two things is the case, either the initial *a* of the following word was elided, or the form was read as Grassmann suggests but spelled as above because of the influence of the vast number of necessary *vṛkís*-forms. The regular form in the Atharvan is *nadyàs*, but the form *nadís* occurs.

vṛṣṭé sápaṁ nadír iva AV 3.24.3.
sárvā yā́ nadyà sthána AV 6.24.3.

The same interchange is found also in *lakṣmí* in the Atharvan, and in this case is the more unexpected as it occurs in successive *pādas*, where the poet might be expected to adhere consistently to his idea of the correct form.

ékaśataṁ lakṣmyò mártyasya AV 7.115.3.
rámantāṁ púṇyā lakṣmíḥ AV 7.115.4.

There remains a group of forms which Lanman calls transition forms. These show interesting turns of declensional variation, for the *vṛkís*-type is not the only one that gives a dissyllabic ending in the nominative plural, as we have seen above under *ambí*. So we find a word like *kṣoṇí* attracted to the *gati*-type. This word is possessed of three declensions [1] : *vṛkís*-, nominative singular ; *devī*-, nominative singular (?) and nominative dual (3), nominative plural (3), accusative plural ; indeterminate, instrumental dual and plural ; *gati*-, nominative plural. This is Grassmann's declensional scheme, but Lanman hesitates to attribute such divergencies in declension to this word as he is forced to do in the case of *aruṇí*. He interprets all *ís*-forms as nominative singular, even including Grassmann's accusative plural, and calls the dual forms in *-ī gati*-forms, thus completely eliminating the *devī*- declension. This is a possible solution and would arouse no suspicion were it not that the instance of *aruṇí* exists.

kṣoṇí —

návanta kṣoṇáyo yathā 10.22.9.
índraṁ kṣoṇír avardhayan vayā́ iva 8.13.17.

1. But see Lanman, *Noun-Inflection* 372, who works from the standpoint of a preconceived theory.

Lanman considers this latter form nominative singular, but as the first member of the comparison is plural the verbal agreement is better if we consider this plural also. It shows the need of the shorter form, except that the following *a* might be elided after *kṣonyò*.

pṛśaní —

ná tấ ní me pṛśanyo jagṛbhre 10.61.8.

This word appears in the nominative singular and in the *devī*-type.

suparṇí : (*suparṇá*) —

suparṇyò vásate mātariśvaḥ 10.88.19.

I see no way in which this word differs from *siṅhí* which Lanman refers to the *vṛkís*-declension on the strength of a single *vṛkís*-form, see above.

samudrí : (*samudrá*) —

divó dhartấ síndhur ấpaḥ samudríyaḥ 10.63.13.

In this we have the word drawn into the *vṛkís*-declension by the influence of the meter. We have also the treatment of the stem-final as *-iy-* as in *cakrí* (see above). I see no reason for excluding any of these words from the list of nouns in question.

In summary : Of the *vṛkís*-nouns, 11 appear in the nominative plural; 3 appear in no other case-form and 1 of these has corresponding *devī*-forms where the *vṛkíṣ*-forms would be incompatible with the meter. Three additional nouns appear in this case with the *vṛkís*-form, but are considered transition forms by Lanman, in my estimation without reason. Of the remaining nouns, *aruṇí* and *kṣoṇí* appear in 3 declensions each at the requirement of the meter. The nouns *nadí* and *lakṣmí* show a tendency towards this in the Atharva Veda.

IV. Accusative Plural : *devīs* : *vṛkías*.

a) Words appearing in this case only :

aṣṭakarṇí : (*aṣṭákarṇa*) —

sahásraṁ me dádato aṣṭakarṇyàḥ 10.62.7.

The *vṛkís*-form is necessary here as it occurs in the cadence of pāda c in a *satobṛhatī*-verse, which is a *jagatī*-pāda. Hence we have a situation similar to that of *atharví*, above. The masculine appears in neither Rig nor Atharva Veda.

kilāsí : (*kilấsa*) —

yád yuyujré kilāsyàḥ 5.53.1.

yātudhānī : (*yātudhāna*) —

sárvāś ca yātudhānyàḥ	1.191.8.
práty oṣa yātudhānyàḥ	10.118.8.

The dissyllabic *vṛkis*-ending is necessary here for the meter. [1]

khārī —

śatáṁ sómasya khāryàḥ	4.32 17.

dehī —

ví navatiṁ náva ca dehyò hán	6.47.2.
yó dehyò ánamayad vadhasnāīḥ	7.6.5.

The *devī*-form would be impossible in the second pāda because the minor caesura must fall after the fourth or the fifth syllable. In the first, the *vṛkis*-form fits the requirements of the *jagatī*-cadence.

b) Words appearing in other cases also :

naptī : (*náptar*) —

śúro ráthasya naptyàḥ	1.50.9.

This word appears also in the Atharvan twice, once as the repetition of the above pāda. The nominative plural in the Atharvan is dissyllabic, *naptyàs*, as though *naptyás*.

meṣī : (*meṣá*) —

sṛjānám áti meṣyàḥ	9.8.5.

yamī : (*yamá*) —

ńīcīr amúṣmāi yamyà ṛtāv' dhaḥ	5.44.4.

starī —

ádhog índra staryò dáṁsupatnīḥ	4.19.7.

nadī —

ákrandayo nadyò róruvad vánā	1.54.1.
abhíṁ índro nadyò vavriṇā hitáḥ	1.54.10.
só arṇavó ná nadyàḥ samudríyaḥ	1.55.2.
tváṁ vṛthā nadyà índra sártave	1.130.5.
kiṁyúr vípro nadyò johavīti	3.33.4.
gharmásvaraso nadyò ápa vran	4.55.6.

1. *yātudhānī* appears in the acc. plur. once in the AV : *ápāha yātudhānīḥ*, 4.18.7. The meter is better in the Pāippalāda, where the ending *-dhānyàḥ* is given. (Cf. Whitney's *Translation*, HOS 7, at this verse). In view of the oxytonization of the *vṛkis*-nouns and its power in the eyes of many of giving declensional forms, the mere presence of a *devī*-form in a word having a shift of accent is interesting.

rā́jā samudrā́ṁ nadyò ví gāhate 9.86.8.
tríḥ sapta sasrā́ nadyò mahír apā́ḥ 10.64.8.

In the following pāda Grassmann suggests the reading *nadís*, regular *devī*-form.

nadyò ajinvad adrúhaḥ 9.9.4.

This case is very similar to that of 7.50.4, treated above under the nominative plural. Here, however, Lanman reads with elision of the *a* of *ajinvad* because of the *-o* caused by *saṁdhi*. Such a solution would have been possible with the above-mentioned case also, as the *nadyò* is followed by a word with initial *a-*. I incline toward Grassmann's solution as it is more in harmony with the treatment as shown in the words of two declensions given so often above. The *vṛkís*-form is to be explained as due to attraction by the many necessary *vṛkís*-forms already listed.

c) Transitions :

samudrī́ : (*samudrá*) —

véda nāváḥ samudríyaḥ 1.25.7.
só arṇavó ná nadyàḥ samudríyaḥ 1.55.2.

See the nominative plural also. Unless Lanman differs from Grassmann in the derivation of this word, I see no difference between it and *meṣī́* : *meṣá*. (Cf. Lanman 365).

yahvī́ —

sá yahvyò 'vánīr góṣv árvā 10.99.4.
vāíśvānarā́ya ṇ́tamāya yahvī́ḥ 1.59.4.

This word gives all the marks of a *devī*-noun, dual *-ī*, plural *-ís*, except for this one accusative plural form. A comparison of the two pādas shows a possible reason for the divergence.

suparṇī́ : (*suparṇá*) —

yujāná indo haritaḥ suparṇyàḥ 9.86.37.

There is no *devī*-form, so the same criticism applies as in the case of *samudrī́* above. This is another case of a word appearing in the cadence of a pāda in a long *jagatī́*-hymn.

aruṇī́ : (*aruṇá*) —

ā́ gha vā yā́bhir aruṇī́r áśikṣatam 1.112.19.
kṣā́mā bhindánto aruṇī́r ápa vran 4.2.16.

Here is a so-called transition from *vṛkís-* to *devī*-type under the influence of meter. I have discussed this word and its declension above.

yātudhānī́ : (*yātudhā́na*) —

This word has been discussed above with its *vṛkís*-form. The *devī*-form is only in the Atharvan.

Other occurrences which Grassmann lists as accusative plural Lanman lists as follows: *kṣoṇís*, 1.57.4, nominative singular; *śakaṭís*, 10.146.3, the same; *rathís*, 3.30.11, nominative singular masculine. *śakaṭí* appears only in this one pāda, and with its shift of accent would be almost inexplicable from Lanman's point of view. Grassmann also in his translation makes it nominative.

Summarizing: The aspect of the accusative plural is more unified than that of other cases. There are 10 nouns of the *vṛkís*-type, with *vṛkís*-endings, and 5 of these appear only in this case. Of these, one word, *yātudhānī́*, has a *devī*-form in the Atharvan. The noun *aruṇí* consistently forms its accusative plural as *devī*-type; in one of the two occurences of this form the *vṛkís*-form is metrically impossible. Other words, *samudrí*, *suparṇí*, and *yahví*, also appear in pādas requiring the form of a *vṛkís*-noun and receive it under such circumstances.

The question of the origin of the forms *devī*, nominative singular, *devīm*, accusative, and *devīs*, nominative-accusative plural, affects the material of the *vṛkís*-declension, so that I shall treat of it here. Lanman (*Noun-Inflection* 366), apparently derived them from *iā*, *iā* + *am*, and *iā* + *as* respectively, following Pott, as noted above. Under what arbitrary conditions, however, did this contraction take place, so that the other *iā*-nouns failed to share it? Their accentuation is just as varied as that of the *devī*-nouns. Further we find traces of the *ī*-suffix in other languages that are inexplicable on this theory. It seems to me preferable to assume that the original Indo-European ending for the nominative singular was *-ī*. The same is perhaps true of the forms in *-īm* and *-īs*; or, in the absence of extra-Sanskritic material, it may be best to assume a very early parallel with the *ā*-stems, as *devīs* : *devī* = *senās* : *senā*. This suggestion is made also by Reichelt on page 176 of his *Awestische Grammatik*. Professor Collitz has suggested [1] that *devī* has in reality three stems, *devī*, *devĭ*, *devyā*.

On the basis of the suggestion that the ending *-īs* is derived from *-iā* + *as*, Lanman gives a transition form *-ias*, which is the form just before it suffered the final contraction. This he assumes to be true

1. *BB* 29.89 ff.

also of the ending *-iam* of the accusative singular. If such were the case, he would have to remove from his list of *vṛkīs*-nouns all words appearing only in both or either of these two forms and not suffering a 'shift of accent', since they might be considered as crystalized remainders of this process of contraction. There are seven such nouns. I myself do not agree with this origin of the ending, as I have shown before.

A word on the masculine nouns of the *vṛkīs*-type may not be amiss. There are thirteen of these; almost all of them appear in the nominative singular only. The list may be found complete in Lanman, page 369. Aside from the word *rathī*, *ahī* appears more often than any other, and I wish to call attention to it particularly. The word is in two declensions, *agni-* as well as *vṛkīs*-type. The *vṛkīs*-forms appear in three cases, genitive singular and nominative and accusative plural, always the same form *ahyàs*. These forms for the *agni*-type would be: *áhes*, *áhayas*, and *áhīn* [1], so that there may have been a bending to metrical necessity in the first and last of these forms. Were it not for the change of accent between *ahī* and *áhī*, the genitive singular form might fall under Whitney § 336. 3, but no change of accent is given for the few words which take this 'normal form *-yàs* (or *-tas*)'. Hence we have throughout a complete change of declension in these forms. The *áhi*-forms are numerous and include three occurrences of *áhes*, genitive singular, and one of *áhayaṣ*, nominative plural. It is not necessary to quote the passages, as they are of the same sort as those quoted so often above.

Without attempting to exhaust the material of these metrical doublets, I wish to call attention to *óṣadhī*, which presents in general the *gati*-declension in the singular and the *devī-* in the plural, save that the forms *óṣadhīs* and *óṣadhīnām* (both very frequent) are indifferent. It is necessary to supply an extra syllable in the nominative plural three times, however, so we find *óṣadhayas* as well as *óṣadhīs* in that form.

If then the *vṛkīs*-declension is not Indo-European in character, but has been, so to speak, evolved out of possible blend-forms by the large number of cases where metrical convenience was involved, it will be well for me to give my idea of the source of this rather interesting declension before I go into the discussion of possible and probable objections. My conclusion is suggested by the position of the declension in Whitney's *Grammar*. Whitney has placed it between the

1. Note change of accent *but not of gender*, *ahī* but *áhī*.

root-nouns and the derivative nouns. And very properly, I think : for it is a mixture of these two declensions; or, more exactly, it is a group of derivative *ī*-stems modified by analogical influence from the root *ī*-stems.

One point is seldom brought up in the comparison thus suggested — the matter of the fixed accent of *vṛkís*. To illustrate the difference between the two declensions, *dhís* and *vṛkís*, I give the following forms :

S.N.	*dhís*	*vṛkís*
A.	*dhíyam*	*vṛkyàm*
I.	*dhiyā́*	*vṛkyā́*
D.	*dhiyé*	*vṛkyé*

And so forth. Note the change of accent to the ending in the *dhís*-forms, which does not take place in the corresponding forms in the *vṛkís*-type. Let us remember, however, that all *dhís*-nouns are monosyllabic, while all *vṛkís*-nouns are polysyllabic. On the other hand compounds of *dhís*-nouns are necessarily polysyllabic, so let us then see whether their accentual conditions differs from those of the simple, *dhís*-type. They do indeed. E.g. :

S. I. *dhiyā́*, but *sudhyà* (or *-dhiyā*), cf. *vṛkyā́*

and so through all the declension. Hence we have before us in *vṛkís* the regular accentuation, as well as the endings, of a polysyllabic (compound) root-noun.

I believe then that the *vṛkís*-forms are originally modifications of the *dcvī*-declension due to the analogy of the compounds of the radical *ī*-stems, especially when occasion was offered for this by the necessities of Vedic meter. The *vṛkís*-nouns are all polysyllabic, and it is worth noting that many of them are themselves compounds (e. g. *aṣṭakarṇí*, *yātudhānī́*, *viśvarūpī́*, *prapharvī́*, *sasarparī́*, *sumaṅgalī́*, *ádurmaṅgalī*). This may have aided in making it possible for their declension to be influenced by the compounds like *sudhís*. Another point of possible similarity between the two groups may be found in the fact that quite a considerable number of the *vṛkís*-nouns are adjectivally used or are descriptive epithets. In fact the use of the word ' noun ' in this connection is rather a loose one. This group of words includes *enī́*, *kalyāṇī́*, *kilāsī́*, *lalāmī́*, *viśvarūpī́*, *aparī́*, *tapanī́*, *kṛṣṇī́*, and a number of others. The principal strength of the suggestion, however, lies in the fact that the *dhís*-declension is clearly prehistoric and includes the only stems in *ī* (the Avestan shortens to *i*) other than the *devī*-

declension which are prehistoric, except perhaps *ýlgr*, cf. p. 8. It cannot therefore be strange that there should be analogical interplay between the two declensions. Such contamination gave rise to analogic forms which were in use but not common enough to attain the rank of a declension, as is shown by their disappearance in later Sanskrit. Metrical necessity then led to the use of these forms when needed by the Vedic poet. Three such coincidences as form, accent, and metrical requirement seem too striking to be merely accidental. The preceding, if correct, would explain the disappearance of the so-called declension in later Sanskrit. If these forms had not crystallized into a declension, and were used in the Rig Veda simply from metrical necessity, it is only natural that they would cease to be used after one of the originating causes had ceased to exist.

Three apparent difficulties present themselves in the way of my theory, which I can best take up in the order of least importance: the locative singular, the change of stem-accentuation between a *vṛkís*-noun and its corresponding masculine in some instances, and the form of the nominative singular in *-s*.

Lanman and Whitney give no locative form for the *vṛkís*-type, and Lanman considers as transitions the two locatives that do appear for words of this type. To these two we may add a third noun *sarasí*, of uncertain type, that appears in the locative. These three forms are: *dūtyắm* (pronounced *dūtiắm*, *devī*-type), 6. 58. 3; *gāurí*, 9. 12. 3; *sarasí*, 7. 103. 2. Johannes Schmidt [1] considered the forms *gāurí* and *sarasí* the true forms of the *vṛkís*-locative. He compared them with the forms of the *tanūs*-type which end in *-ū*, and the form in *-an*, having no ending (the latter 203 from 45 stems). On the analogy of other *vṛkís*-forms, however, we should expect the locative form to be that of the *sudhís*-declension. This would give us *gāuryì* or possibly *gāuríyi*. Schmidt's explanation may be correct, but it is at least possible that in *gāurí* and *sarasí* we have the genuine old locatives in stem-final-*ī* plus locative ending *ĭ*, fusing to *ī*. The form *dhiyi*, appearing in Classical Sanskrit, would then be an analogical formation to *dhiyắ*, etc. Metrical convenience may have stepped in to prevent this analogical process in the case of these two words, *gāurí* and *sarasí*, in the Veda.

The second supposed difficulty, the change of accent from the corresponding masculine noun, may be as simply explained. *vṛkís*-nouns

1. *KZ* 27. 306; *Pluralbildung* 55, note.

are all oxytone, but *devī*-nouns are not and may have the accent on any syllable of the word. Twenty-two of the *vṛkís*-words, however, correspond to masculine non-oxytone stems (mostly in *-a*) and this has been regarded as a great difficulty. When we remember, however, that the compounds of radical *ī*-stems (type *sudhís*) are also always oxytone, the solution appears simpler. The *vṛkís*-words have taken over the regular accentuation of the *sudhís*-type along with its case-endings and its treatment of the accent in the declensional forms. This only makes the assimilation of the two more complete. Even barytone masculines had to have oxytone feminines when they followed this declension. It must be borne in mind, moreover, that the accentuation of the masculine is by no means always kept in feminine derivation, though this is undoubtedly the usual thing. For example we have such doublets as *aruṣá* : *áruṣī* ; *taviṣá* : *táviṣī*, and several others, listed on page 368 of Lanman's treatise. And one may recall that in *áhi* : *ahí* we have change of accent with the change of declension even though there is no change of gender. This in itself seems to point to the correctness of my explanation.

The third apparent difficulty is in the form of the nominative singular in *-s* in the Veda. It cannot well be explained metrically, as a hiatus-filler or otherwise, but the theory of its Indo-European origin seems even more improbable, since the arguments from comparative etymology seem scarcely valid. Three words appear in the other languages which belong to the *vṛkís*-declension in Vedic Sanskrit — *naptís*, *vṛkís*, and *starís* ; and they appear as follows : Latin *neptis* ; Old Norse *ýlgr* ; Greek στεῖρα. In the last, the Greek has no *-s*. Though the *-s* appears in the other two they can scarcely be adduced as proof for Sanskrit. A language like Latin which can show the following forms from old *devī*-stems, *dea*, *regīna*, *neptis*, not to mention a new form of stem in *-īc-*, cannot be made the basis for proof in so delicate a shade of declensional variation unless it preserves the length of the stem-final ; for the word *neptis* in becoming an *i*-stem would automatically receive an *-s*, the characteristic sign of the nominative of *i*-stems. *ýlgr* is also too problematical for our purposes. In the first place it defies all rules of Norse consonantism, which would require the dropping of the entire labio-velar when it became a sonant by the influence of the following accent (Verner's Law). Professor Collitz suggests that the *-g-* might be a borrowing from *vargr*. This might also account for the *-r*. In any case the word is reduced to an *i*-stem, and it would naturally have the *-r* of that declension.

Even in Sanskrit itself, moreover, there are four *vṛkīs*-words which appear in the Atharvan with *devī*-nominatives : *ádurmaṅgalī*, *sumaṅgalī*, *nadī* (3 times, the *only* Vedic or Sanskrit nominative for this word) and *vilipṭī* (2). The last word does not appear in the Rig, nor does *nadī* in the nominative singular. The others show nominative singular forms in *-īs*. *napṭī* appears in the Atharvan with *gatī*-form *napṭīs*, interesting because of the Latin *neptis*.

The appearance of an *-s* in the nominative singular of a feminine in the Veda is not so extraordinary that it should excite too much comment. Derivative stems in *-ā*, and in *-ī*, it is true, do not have it, and they bulk large in our feeling for the feminine declension ; but it is an integral part of the *ĭ*-declension and the *ŭ*-declension, which have great scope in the Veda. And it is important to note the fact that it belongs to the root-nouns and to the two derivative declensions that have come under their influence, the *vṛkīs*- and *tanūs*-types. Here again we evidently have a borrowing by analogy of the ending of the other *ī*-declension, a further illustration of modification induced by analogy in these two declensions.

We have an interesting parallel to the use of variant forms to suit the exigencies of meter in the forms of the instrumental singular of nouns in *-ā*. Already in Indo-Iranian this case had borrowed the ending of the pronoun and we have the following equation : Skt. *senayā* : *senā* = Av. *haēnaya* : *haēna*. In sporadic forms, however, the original ending *-ā* is found in both languages. The conditions are almost the opposite of those in the *vṛkīs*-declension, since in the latter the borrowed forms are the sporadic ones. The following interesting material is gained from the study of this one case : the instrumental singular of *svadhā́* appears in *-ā* 2, in *-ayā* 26 times ; syllabic count is, of course, involved in each case. *śravasyā*, on the other hand, presents a different picture, *-ayā* 1, *-ā* 7 ; the latter form appears in the majority of cases in the *triṣṭubh*-cadence. A very interesting word is *vacasyā́* : the instrumental singular appears 5 times in the Rig Veda and always in the cadence *-ayā*, 2, *jagatī* ; *-ā*,3, *triṣṭubh*. Lanman 357, calls attention to the metrical use of these two forms. Even more interesting is the word *pavā*, which appears twice in the Rig Veda in successive verses :

ayā́ pavā́ pavasvāinā́ vásūni 9·97·52.
utá nā́ enā́ pavayā́ pavasva 9·97·53.

Since the expression in which *pavā* stands concatenates, everything

tends to similarity rather than to divergence in the above forms. Yet in spite of this the divergence exists. So we have in this case the opposite of the condition in the *vṛkṣ*-declension. The declension began, even in prehistoric times, to conform its instrumental singular to that of the pronoun, but where the meter would not admit of such a change the older form was retained. Perhaps the similarity of the ending of the same case of the root-nouns in *-ā* assisted in this retention.

To summarize : the *vṛkṣ*-nouns are originally *devī*-nouns, some of whose forms have been modified on analogy of compound root-nouns in *ī* (type *su-dhīs*). While not originating in the Veda, these forms were often adopted because of the exigencies of Vedic meter : the analogical forms often occur in positions where the *devī*-forms would be metrically impossible. The new forms agree with the *su-dhīs*-declension not only in endings (including nominative singular *-s*), but in accentual scheme (the stem-vowel always has the accent). They are moreover all oxytone, even when they are parallel to masculine barytones. This too is doubtless due to imitation of the *su-dhīs*-words which are characterized by oxytone accentuation. My theory seems, therefore, to satisfy the conditions of the problem better than any suggestion hitherto advanced.

VITA

Ruth Norton was born in Elizabeth, New Jersey. After completing her secondary school work, she entered Lake Erie College, Painesville, Ohio, whence she was graduated in 1914 with the degree of Bachelor of Arts with her major subject in German. She obtained the degree of Master of Arts from the University of Wisconsin after a further year's study in the German department, 1915. After two years of teaching in Sioux Falls, S.D., she entered the Graduate School of the University of Pennsylvania as University Scholar in German. The following winter, 1918, she entered the Graduate School of the Johns Hopkins University, where she held successively a University Scholarship (German), a University Fellowship (Sanskrit), and, on receiving the Graduate Fellowship from her Alma Mater, a Fellowship by Courtesy from the Johns Hopkins University. Here it was her privilege to work under both Professor Collitz and Professor Bloomfield in her work in Germanic and later Indo-European Philology. She obtained the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in 1921. She is glad to take this occasion for thanking not only Professor Bloomfield and Professor Collitz for their help and for the inspiration they have always given her, but also Professor Shumway of the University of Pennsylvania, Professor Edgerton of the University of Pennsylvania, now of Yale University, and Professor Bolling of Ohio State University, for their share in preparing her for this work, both by personal help and by the insight they have given her into the value of scholarly endeavor. She was married in 1921 in Jerusalem, Palestine, to William F. Albright, Ph. D., Director of the American School of Oriental Research in that city.

PROTAT BROTHERS, PRINTERS, MACON (FRANCE. — MCMXXVII)

P25 .L287 v.1-5
The Vedic declension of the type vrkis,
Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 00026 8864